

**LITTLE HOOVER COMMISSION
YOUTH CRIME AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION**

**GROVER TRASK
District Attorney, County of Riverside**

Little Hoover Commission
Youth Crime and Violence Prevention

Index

I.	Prevention Strategy must be a High Priority	2
A.	Findings: Family and Individual Factors Affecting Delinquency	3
B.	Findings: Community Factors Affecting Delinquency	4
C.	Findings: Societal Factors Affecting Delinquency	5
D.	Findings: Linkages and Collaboration	5
E.	Findings: Prevention and Intervention	6
F.	Findings: Overall	7
G.	16 Task Force Recommendations	7
II.	Proposition 21 Impact on Youth Crime and Violence Prevention	10
A.	How Does Prop. 21's Deferred Entry of Judgment Work?	10
B.	Additional Law Enforcement Tools	11
III.	Local Riverside County Prevention/Intervention DA Partnership Programs	12
A.	Overview of Riverside County's Multi-Agency Youth Accountability Program (YAT)	12
B.	Linkage/Prosecution/Community Involvement	16
C.	The Four YAT Programs	17
D.	Funding	22
E.	Riverside County Kids With Guns Protocol	23
IV.	The Effectiveness of Local Crime Prevention Funding	25
A.	Three Recommendations to Congress	25

Appendix

**Little Hoover Commission
Youth Crime and Violence Prevention**

District Attorney Grover Trask

I. California's Youth Crime and Violence Prevention Strategy Must be a High Priority That is Balanced and Integrated with California's Intervention and Enforcement Strategies to Create a Comprehensive California Juvenile Delinquency Violence Prevention Plan

How do we effectively prevent juvenile delinquency? Is it possible to actually deter at-risk children from entering the juvenile justice system? How does society best ensure public safety?

These questions were underscored at the deliberations of the 1996 Task Force to Review Juvenile Crime and the Juvenile Justice Response. The vast majority of expert testimonies reinforced the need for prevention approaches to curb delinquency, stressing that in order to get tough on crime we must get tough on the causes of crime. According to the testimony of San Diego Deputy District Attorney Robert Amador, “. . . even juvenile court prosecutors, believe that prevention is greatly needed.”

While addressing the issues of juvenile crime, particularly violent juvenile crime, though sanctions and punishment are important, we will never effectively impact the continuance of juvenile crime or the escalating nature of their severity until we put strong prevention and intervention measure into place.

The old question is: How do we approach prevention? We need to know what the underlying conditions are that lead to crime and who may be at risk of becoming involved in delinquent behaviors due to exposure to those conditions. From that information we can best determine what strategies can interrupt movement toward criminal behavior.

No single cause for crime can be definitively identified. Research supports that it is the culmination of factors that is important. The more negative factors experienced by an individual the greater he or she is at risk. Some of these factors include physical and verbal abuse, availability of drugs and firearms, low family or community attachment, family violence, and academic failures. Conversely, researchers are also identifying “protective factors” that seem to make an individual more resilient to engaging in criminal behavior. Prevention and intervention efforts must concentrate on decreasing the number of risk factors in a child's life while increasing the protective factors.

Problem children in effect reflect troubled families and neighborhoods; therefore, any prevention effort targeting children has to be inclusive of the home environment. Community violence, family violence, father absence, and drug and alcohol abuse by parents can dramatically compromise a child's overall well-being in the earliest stages of life. Today researchers, such as Rand's Peter Greenwood, Ph.D., are advocating what we have intuitively known all along: programs implemented at the earliest possible stages of a child's life, are more likely to deter troubled children from crime.

And as Barry Krisberg, President of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency noted:
"The results are substantial and compelling that as long as we allow child abuse and family violence to run rampant in this state, we'll have a very large segment of our youth population who will in turn become violent offenders . . . we know that if we can significantly and dramatically reduce child abuse and neglect, then we can reduce violence . . ."

Aggression and violent behaviors are experienced and learned by children primarily in the home. When parents perpetrate violence against children, severe trauma can result which significantly affects a child's emotional and psychological development. Children rely on parents to protect, guide, and establish boundaries for them; however, children are more inclined to override the normal controls of violent impulses when parents are abusive to each other and to them.

Intervention is made that much more difficult in adolescent years when delinquent behaviors and other interconnected problems such as school failure, substance abuse, and teenage pregnancy begin to appear. Even at this stage, however, before a child begins to develop a pattern of serious criminal behavior, appropriate intervention programs are far more effective at mitigating delinquency than non-action. In its simplest form, early prevention and intervention create a secure, supportive environment where a child can thrive. Whether through an individual or organization, prevention and early intervention strategies foster positive, sustained human interactions that not only lay the foundation for a child's successful development, but enable parents to become responsible, "prevention agents" in their child's life even before problem behaviors arise.

1996 Task Force Juvenile Delinquency Findings Revisited

A. Findings - Family and Individual Factors Affecting Delinquency

1. If a child experiences serious long-term disruptions or separations from parents, if there is domestic violence, substance abuse, or child abuse and neglect, the child's development task of attachment can be compromised.
2. Lack of parenting skills has been shown to be a significant risk factor. Family services can promote positive parenting by providing a supportive training volunteer or professional to visit the home of new parents, taking a comprehensive approach to help parents identify and use community resources, and providing information about child development.

3. Nationally, more than 70% of juveniles in state reform (correctional) institutions come from fatherless homes.
4. Many of the risk factors for delinquency can be further magnified in households headed by teenage mothers who lack maturity and supportive resources.
5. Alcohol and drug problems begin developing in childhood. Many adolescents with substance abuse problems come from alcohol and drug dependent families. Treating the adolescent without treating the family is apt to be less effective.
6. Alcohol is consumed by youth far more often than other illicit drugs. Studies show that alcohol is more likely to be found in the systems of individuals arrested for committing violent crimes than any other drugs.
7. Status offenders can frequently be traced back to problems being experienced by the youth in their family such as child abuse and neglect' poor family communication; and/or lack of parental guidance or support.
8. Routinely administered mental health screenings for inclusion in the social study of each minor awaiting disposition that incorporate medical, psychiatric, social work, public health, educational and legal expertise can provide an accurate and comprehensive assessment.
9. Improving school attendance and performance can impact the juvenile justice system, as research confirms that there exists a relationship between school failure and delinquent and/or criminal behavior.
10. Classroom size can impact both performance on achievement tests and the opportunity for positive adult/child contacts.
11. Many students entering the juvenile justice system demonstrate severe deficiencies in basic academic skills. The role of court schools in the juvenile justice system is to provide educational services to students. Due to their incarceration, this is an opportune time to work diligently to motivate these students in the learning process.

B. Findings - Community Factors Affecting Delinquency

1. The family does not exist in a vacuum. Research confirms the important role communities play in prevention of violence.

2. Children exposed to chronic and/or acute levels of violence tend to evidence disorder attachment behaviors that may contribute to substance abuse and later violent behavior.
3. Children who see the world through the lens of aggression behave and act more aggressive. Research shows by the age of eight, patterns of aggression are so well established in children that they become predictive through adulthood unless there is intervention.
4. Socially toxic influences have penetrated earlier and earlier in the life span, and therefore our prevention and intervention efforts must start earlier to counteract them.
5. There exists a relationship between school failure and delinquent and/or criminal behavior.

C. Findings - Societal Factors Affecting Delinquency

1. Youth have too easy access to firearms in the state of California. Violent youth crime is directly related to the availability of firearms.
2. Youth employment is a “protective” factor that can counter the effects of family poverty, provide for the development of essential work and social skills, and help integrate youth into society’s social structures.
3. Poverty places youth at greater risk of crime, both as victims and perpetrators. Investing in children, to ensure quality education and widely available child care is a cost-effective means of preventing violence.
4. Even children with a large number of risk factors to chronic and violent behavior can, if given enough protective and supportive factors, become productive citizens. Society can correct delinquent behavior if it is willing to invest enough in protective factors.

D. Findings - Linkages and Collaboration

1. Families can receive services from a social worker, school counselor, probation officer, public health nurse, teacher and school nurse **B** without these professionals ever consulting each other. Funding constraints and traditional divisions of turf preclude development of multi-disciplinary efforts.

2. Categorical funding approaches lead to fragmentation and inefficiencies in service delivery, duplication and gaps in the services provided, and an inflexible system that addresses only some of the families' service needs.
3. There is poor statewide coordination of community, county and regional juvenile crime prevention programs. Improved coordination efforts are needed to identify, evaluate, fund and replicate successful youth crime prevention programs.
4. As with categorical funding, programs with a single-issue approach may reduce the effectiveness of the services and miss the opportunity to address underlying needs of clients in a comprehensive way. Prevention and treatment programs which promote lifestyles that discourage high risk behaviors must consider the interrelationships between drug addiction, school failure, teenage pregnancy, etc., and juvenile delinquency.
5. Incarceration has a limited value as a juvenile crime prevention strategy. Real and long-term reductions in juvenile crime are most likely to come from implementation of comprehensive statewide youth crime prevention approaches. Such approaches must be adequately funded.
6. Community-based organizations lack the resources to support existing and evolving violence prevention efforts.
7. Leadership can plan an important role in simplifying and improving service systems for children and families.

E. Findings - Prevention and Intervention

1. Family dysfunction, such as child abuse or neglect and domestic violence is documented to be a strong risk factor leading to youth crime and violence. Comprehensive services to strengthen the family help to prevent child abuse by building an immediate and trusting relationship between families and service providers at a non-stigmatized time (childbirth) when many families need or accept assistance.
2. Too many of California's youth are from homes without a positive, caring role model.
3. Victims and the community believe they can have a role in prevention and early intervention by holding minors accountable for their actions.

4. Quality community policing looks to develop and stabilize neighborhoods. The old style of policing disenfranchised some communities from the mainstream. People want to deal with those they have a relationship with, and although they might not trust every officer, they have the ability to trust the ones they know.

F. Findings Overall

1. The most powerful deterrent to juvenile crime is the existence of quality human relationships. Children develop attachment through relationship building and positive interactions. The essence of human relationships is sustained interaction by an individual or individuals who support and nurture children to become healthy and lead productive lives.
2. Parents have the ultimate responsibility to provide nurturance, physical, emotional and financial support, guidance, protection, and a value system for their children. This includes the development of a sense of responsibility of self, family and community. Parents need to spend time with their children, to listen to them, to pay attention to influences of peers, environment, media and social pressures.
3. The community has the responsibility to support the family in efforts to provide effective parenting.
4. Community and government programs should be designed and administered to achieve these goals.
5. The goal of prevention and early intervention efforts is to decrease the risk factors for delinquency in a child's life and increase the resiliency factors. (See Attachment B - Risk Factors Associated with Problem Behaviors).

G. Recommendations

1. We recommend that California fund family-based strategies which have been evaluated and have proven to be effective be replicated for prevention and early intervention across the life-span of high risk youths. A continuum of services beginning at birth to the late teenage years must be provided that are family-centered and build on the strengths of parents and their children. Several models are recommended for different stages of a child's development and can be found in the Appendix Attachment A.
2. We recommend that California adequately invest in substance abuse prevention and treatment programs for youths and their families.

3. We recommend that California mandate and fund a prevention component in every juvenile probation department whereby interagency collaborative efforts can be directed toward working with first time or status offenders who are assessed as likely to move deeper into the juvenile justice system.
4. We recommend that the California Department of Mental Health develop a protocol for a pilot study to determine the incidence/prevalence of mental illness and/or mental disorders in at-risk juveniles offenders. Included in this pilot study will be recommendations regarding treatment needs and system changes necessary.
5. We recommend that California conduct awareness campaigns to educate the public regarding the risk factors and provide services targeted to communities identified as having high rates of domestic violence, teenage pregnancy and childbearing, drug and alcohol addiction, school failure, welfare dependency, and juvenile delinquency.
6. We recommend that California schools become integral parts of the community by utilizing their physical sites as community service centers or service delivery systems.
7. We recommend that California utilize education resources to implement and appropriately fund prevention and early intervention programs which decrease school failure.
8. We recommend that California determine effective educational program models for the juvenile justice system and implement those programs.
9. We recommend that California provide necessary funding to hire more teachers and reduce average class size.
10. We recommend that California promote employment readiness training and jobs for youths.
11. We recommend that, given the rise in single parent homes and dual income earners, state and local governments should allocate more resources to child care services.
12. We recommend that California adopt legislation that:
 - a. Eliminates barriers to inter and intra agency sharing of information;

- b. Supports system reform that strengthens the capacity of families to care for their own children; and
 - c. Reduces the number of children placed in out of home care including institutions.
- 13. We recommend that California acknowledge the importance of prevention efforts by creating a special awards program that honors the efforts of communities that actively reduce juvenile delinquency and elevates the status of prevention efforts.
 - 14. We recommend that California continue to support statewide mentoring efforts.
 - 15. We recommend that California support community policing programs.
 - 16. We recommend that California continue to support the role of the court schools in the juvenile justice system.

Note: District Attorney Grover Trask chaired the ACalifornia Task Force to Review Juvenile Crime and the Juvenile Justice Response.@ The above-referenced materials are taken from the September 1996 final report.

Conclusion

Thirty years of research has shown that the most effective prevention strategies are those that focus on risk and protective factors that fall into five broad categories: the juvenile, the community, the family, the peer group, and the school. Moreover, these factors tend to accumulate and interact with one another over time.

Achieving long-term public safety requires a balanced comprehensive strategy that combines enforcement and sanctions with effective and accountable programs focused on reducing risk factors and increasing protective factors for our youth. (See Appendix C - How a Prevention System Should Work).

II. Proposition 21 Impact on Youth Crime and Violence Prevention

It is far too early to make definitive predictions about the impact Prop. 21 will have on youth crime and violence prevention. However, there is broad multi-institutional support from law enforcement and social service agencies that increased focus and resources belong at the front end of the system.

Prop. 21 created 790 Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC). This new law may very well have a very positive prevention impact on youth crime and violence because it deals with youth accountability in a positive restorative approach. It has the potential, if adequately funded through the probation department, of enhancing individual treatment. The ultimate goal is that the juvenile offender would exit the juvenile justice system more capable of living in the community as a responsible, law-abiding citizen. Unfortunately, probation departments are not adequately funded to emphasize engaging specified juvenile offenders in such restorative activities. However, Prop. 21's 790 WIC provision is a first step in revitalizing the mission of juvenile court by eliminating the uncontested informal probation for felons and replacing it with a "deferred entry of judgment." The key to intervention in kids lives who are committing crimes is accountability to the community, to the victims, and to themselves. 790 WIC also has the additional requirement that the parent or guardian must attend court and participate as directed by the probation department and the court.

A. How does Prop. 21's Deferred Entry of Judgment work?

790 WIC juveniles involved in the commission of a felony offense when there is:

No previous wardship on felony offenses
No 707(b) WIC serious violent offense
No CYA history
No previous probation revocation without successful completion of probation
Minor is 14 years or older
Minor is eligible for probation

Then the juvenile may voluntarily participate in the deferred entry of judgment program:

- Minor admits the charges, waives time for sentence pronouncement
- Probation department determines appropriate program for education, treatment, and rehabilitation of minor. The court makes the final determination.
- Parent/guardian required to be at court and participate as directed by the court
- DA, court, or probation can schedule a dispositional hearing if it appears there is non-compliance with the terms or the minor is not benefitting
- If minor satisfactorily completes designated program, case is dismissed except for future deferral review by DA and probation and sealed for all purposes

- Allows for warrantless searches, random drug and alcohol testing and compliance with curfew and school attendance requirements
- Restitution to victim also may be required
- Probation department is the program administrator structuring the rehabilitation efforts on a needs assessment of the youth

B. The Initiative Provides Additional Tools to Law Enforcement by:

- Requiring gang members who have been convicted of felonies to register with local law enforcement officials for up to five years
- Prohibiting the sealing or destroying the juvenile records of minors who are at least 14 years old and commit a violent offense
- Allowing the official records of violent juvenile offenders to be made public
- For large, urban counties with particularly invasive gang problems, Prop. 21 may prove useful in combating gang violence and proliferation. The additional tools to law enforcement and district attorneys include gang registration with local law enforcement, enhanced tracking, and streamlined reporting on juvenile felons' dispositions. These reforms will help communities to gain ground on youth and adult gang violence.

It is also my opinion that the new California procedural process of identifying and controlling a small group of serious, violent and chronic offenders as adults will free-up juvenile resources to focus on needy youth within the juvenile justice system. (See III).

III. Local Riverside County Prevention/Intervention District Attorney Partnership Programs (Federal/State/County Funded)

A. Overview of Riverside County's Multi-Agency Youth Accountability Program (YAT)

Prosecutors can and are playing a significant role in reducing and preventing juvenile involvement in drug related criminal activities and keeping young people out of trouble. Prosecutors can take leadership in and responsibility for the development and implementation of special programs, give referrals or function as a part of a broader community wide juvenile justice effort.

Because prosecutor needs vary by jurisdiction, it is only by tailoring programs to address local crime and offenders that system efficiency and offender prevention efforts and accountability can be advanced. The following programs address this new community-based prosecution effort especially with other agencies' activities and involved the community at large.

The **YAT program** addresses the following problems:

- Meaningful intervention with at-risk youth often occurs only after minors have established a pattern of delinquency.
- An impacted juvenile justice system does not allow for appropriate monitoring or a proactive, community-based restorative justice approach to intervention.
- Lack of interagency partnerships and community involvement results in less effective or minimal services being provided to juvenile offenders, and a greater risk to public safety.

Late Intervention: While nearly 60% of all first time juvenile offenders do not return to the system, juveniles who are arrested five or more times have a 75% to 90% likelihood of re-offending. Locally, we observed that not until repeated contact with law enforcement and the juvenile justice system did minors receive significant consequences and rehabilitative services to address delinquent behavior and build competency skills.

Impacted System: The original focus of the juvenile justice system was on early intervention. More recently, it has become a system dealing predominantly with violent crime, long term detention and increased provisions for punishment as adults. As a result, more of already limited juvenile justice system resources are spent on youth only after commission of numerous or serious offenses.

Due to enormous caseloads and limited financial resources, minors on probation spend very little time before a judge and receive little to no supervision in the community from probation officers. Thus, an accurate assessment of a minor's rehabilitative needs and potential

threat to public safety is not maintained and available for the court. Furthermore, terms of probation are not strictly enforced; when a violation of probation occurs, it may take weeks or even months before the minor appears before a judge. This not only fails to benefit the offender, but also undermines the faith of the community in the effectiveness of the justice system.

Lack of Partnerships: Prior to the YAT program, the lack of community involvement and partnerships among juvenile justice system agencies often led to status or first time offenders receiving no services or consequences. Given that Riverside County is geographically the fourth largest and sixth most populous California county, with approximately 1.5 million residents, it became apparent that without exploring a community-based approach, the needs of many at-risk children could not be addressed.

Proposed Solution: Early and meaningful intervention on lesser offenses reduces the likelihood of juveniles committing more serious criminal acts. As a result, the Youth Accountability Team (YAT) program focuses on three primary goals: intervention on status offenses such as curfew and truancy violations, which are early indicators of future delinquent behavior; forging partnerships among law enforcement, prosecution, schools, and citizens in target communities to effectively monitor and help at-risk children, and, when necessary, prosecute minors already on probation; and, finally, removal of dangerous youthful offenders from the community.

The YAT program aims to enhance the opportunity for status and first-time offenders to succeed through enhancing their understanding of the impact of their actions on themselves, possible victims, and the community while securing public safety through aggressive intervention with more serious offenders. The program has been fully implemented in three communities and a fourth is near implementation.

The YAT Program Model: The YAT program uses juvenile justice system resources and focuses them toward a much earlier stage of the juvenile delinquency problem. The program operates in high schools and middle schools.

One school site within a school district is designated to house each community program. From this central location other schools in the district are also served. One or more representatives from law enforcement, probation and school district administration staff the program at each site. Two Riverside County deputy district attorneys currently assigned to the YAT program work in partnership with these representatives, and are responsible for one or more community-based programs; this is a pro-active role for prosecutors in a community setting. In order to rapidly address status and infraction offenses, citations are issued to minors both on and off campus. Juveniles who commit infractions away from campus can be returned to their own school or taken directly to the YAT district site and processed through the Citation Program by a YAT member, as described later. The latter approach alleviates tying up law enforcement officers by getting them back to the field quickly.

Minors who commit more serious offenses are processed through referral by law enforcement to the probation department and then to the district attorney. The YAT probation officer in each community program has access to the list of all youthful offenders in that district and may identify specific minors for intervention within the YAT process. Further, based on information received from school representatives and/or community sources such as business owners or church leaders, at-risk children may also be identified for participation. Finally, the deputy district attorney assigned to the team may select certain minors with new or pending cases for YAT intervention and handling. In identifying minors for participation, consideration is given to the likelihood of rehabilitation through competency development and personal accountability, while balancing the need for community safety from potentially violent offenders.

The YAT program at each site focuses on first time offenders as well as those youth who are, or are at-risk to become, serious offenders. The team also gathers intelligence from community sources, conducts investigations, and prosecutes when appropriate those minors known to pose a danger to a school or the community because of serious or repeated criminal offenses. Team members solicit community input regarding program design strategies through community education presentations.

Intervention Strategies: A variety of program elements have been designed to focus on juvenile delinquency early intervention. Each program is tailored to best meet the needs of the community it serves through ongoing input from team members, school administrators, and community leaders. No one program uses all of the strategies, and the strategies used may be changed for the better effect, if needed. Each strategy is described below:

1. Citation Program: Youth are cited for infractions such as truancy, disturbing the peace or possession of tobacco or paraphernalia. The offenders are taken to the YAT site, cited and remanded to the custody of their parents. Next, they and their parents must appear before the juvenile court. Minors found guilty may be required to pay fines, perform community service, or face suspension of driver's license privileges. Some sites will allow first-time offenders to have their truancy cases dismissed if they achieve perfect attendance and complete community service at the school district within a specified period of time.
2. Truancy Abatement: the YAT checks with parents and schools to ascertain if a minor has been truant. Truancy sweeps are also performed in areas where minors may loiter when not attending school. A truancy sweep can even pick up juvenile offenders when a local business community member calls to report suspected truants. The YAT immediately deals with the issue through methods such as admonishment, detention of the minor and transport to school, or filing a violation of probation and incarceration in juvenile hall.

3. Personal Contact: Minors receive intensive supervision. The minors, and often their parents, are contacted monthly, weekly, and in some cases daily, depending on need. Contact is made by one or more YAT site members. The contacts may occur at a minor's school, home or in the community.
4. Tutoring, Mentoring, & Outside Agency Collaboration: Youth referred to the YAT will have their academic progress continuously checked via school records and contact with teachers. Students performing poorly must participate in the tutoring program and in a summer education program. Area colleges provide tutors as well as mentors. Collaboration with outside agencies such as the Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base also serves to motivate at risk minors.
5. Drug Testing: Minors on probation are required to participate in random drug testing. A positive drug test constitutes a violation of probation and will likely result in a juvenile hall commitment or other consequence ordered by the court. Drug counseling may also be ordered.
6. Juvenile Hall & Prison Tours: Youthful offenders participate in tours to show the harsh reality of life in custody and to discourage the minors from committing acts that can lead to incarceration.
7. Campus Visits: Team members regularly visit district campuses to meet and dialogue with students on a friendly and informal basis. Presentations for youth are geared to juveniles not yet involved in the criminal justice system. These presentations focus on decision making and the possible social and legal consequences of negative or criminal behavior. Presentations to parents focus on juvenile delinquency causes, solutions, resources and the importance of close parental supervision and involvement. This element is extremely important as an early intervention tool, as well as a forum for parental input.
8. Presentations: YAT Program members give informational presentations to local schools and churches frequently. In addition, members have also spoken before statewide and national education and law enforcement organizations. Because of this exposure, the YAT Program model is being reviewed for implementation in many areas across the country.
9. Community Patrol: The team frequently patrols the target community. This allows the team to get to know community residents and provides a constant law enforcement presence and interaction in the community that can deter crime or stop crime while in progress, as well as facilitating close supervision of involved minors.

10. Counseling: Juveniles referred to the program, as well as their parents, are offered counseling services free of charge. Counseling is mandatory for certain minors who have been sentenced on infractions, gone through youth court or are on probation. Counseling services, offered through allied agencies such as County Mental Health and the Youth Service Center, include individual or group counseling or therapy, and an intensive substance abuse program. Topics include decision making, conflict resolution, substance abuse, anger management, and employment and job hunting skills.
11. Hearing Officers Program: The juvenile court has the ability to appoint non-attorney hearing officers to handle certain infractions at community courts. However, until the YAT program there was no coordinated effort to take advantage of this much-needed intervention tool. Qualified and trained community leaders designated by the juvenile court may now preside over such cases, imposing consequences including fines and community service.
12. Focused Prosecution: Minors in the YAT program are extensively monitored and supervised. When the minor appears before the judge, the judge is fully briefed on how the minor is performing on probation. With the support of the juvenile court judges, probationers are given stayed custody time and regular review hearings where needed. At the first sign of transgression, the minor may be taken immediately into custody and transported to juvenile hall, or referred to the juvenile court judge for admonishment and further consequences up to and including placement in a suitable facility. With such swift action, the offender immediately learns that inappropriate behavior will not be tolerated.
13. Youth Court: This program element is a peer court that focuses on first time and low-level misdemeanor juvenile offenses. There are student attorney prosecution and defense representatives, as well as a student jury. The judge is a local attorney volunteer. While there is no formal admission to the charges, in order to participate, the juvenile offender must agree not to contest the charges. The jury recommends the consequence, subject to approval by the judge. Consequences may include letters of apology to victims, community service, creating a life plan and counseling. All defendants must return to court and serve as jurors in future proceedings of other defendants.

B. Prosecution/Community Involvement

Current Links: The YAT program model was designed as a multi-agency collaborative effort to bring juvenile intervention strategies directly into target communities. Currently, community involvement in intervention strategies includes the participation of local businesses in truancy enforcement through a call-in program; additionally, parents are informed of the supervisory and citation program aspects when their children are registered for school, and their

input is solicited at a group presentation by YAT members. Input regarding the success of various intervention strategies is also solicited through meetings with church and community groups.

Future Efforts - Community Advisory Committees: To enhance community involvement, an advisory committee will be formed at each YAT site. These committees will function as boards of directors at each YAT site. Committees will consist of the present complement of YAT members as well as community representatives who initially will be invited to participate based on prior involvement with the program, and/or leadership in the community such as business owners, church leaders, community-based organization leaders, and parents of successfully treated offenders.

The formal addition of community members to the decision-making process will increase the creativity of program interventions, as well as the strength of the program in the community over the long term. The committee activities can include but are not limited to: reviewing program measurements to monitor program success; seeking creative ways to increase community awareness and involvement; developing partnerships with community organizations to increase available services; ensuring program success stories are presented in local print and broadcast media; and, designing new interventions to meet program goals.

The immediate benefit to the YAT program will be in its increased ability to assess its effectiveness and perception in the community, disseminate information from the program to the respective stakeholders, and bring on new services and refine current features of the program in order to more effectively achieve the goals of early intervention.

C. The Four YAT Programs

1. MAYCIT: Multi Agency Youth Community Intervention Team

Sources of juveniles:

Informal probation

Formal probation

Truancy Program: Perris Truancy Abatement Program

Approximately 65 minors in the program

Mission Statement

Our mission is to develop a long term pro-active strategy against juvenile crime and truancy involving a partnership with schools, law enforcement, probation, social services and the community. The authority of the district attorney's office is to be used, whenever possible, to solve delinquency problems before any criminal involvement; to improve public safety; and, the quality of life in cooperation with the schools and the Perris community.

Objectives

Objective I: Expand the Perris Union High School District School Attendance Review Board (S.A.R.B.) Program.

Objective II: Educate middle and high school students via district attorney's outreach program regarding the justice system, A safe schools@ policy, and the benefits of education.

Objective III: Establish a multi-agency assessment program to examine first time offenders where a petition has been filed. Identify the at-risk indicators and develop a comprehensive course of corrective action for the juvenile and the family.

Objective IV: Participate and support Youth Accountability Boards, school conflict resolution and mediation programs.

Objective V: Develop A safe schools@ policy identifying target criminal offenses for mandatory investigation and prosecution.

Objective VI: Develop a citywide truancy enforcement program.

Objective VII: Prosecute chronic, habitual and violent juvenile offenders as adults.

MAYCIT Referral Process

Target population: juveniles, ages 7-18, first-time offenders, who may be experiencing one or more of the following profile factors:

- Poor school behavior or performance. (May include truancy, suspensions or expulsion, and/or failing grades).
- Chronic family problems. (Predominantly identified by a lack of adequate parental supervision, structure, and support for pro-social activities).
- Drug or alcohol use. (Any consistent use, regardless of amount).
- Pre-delinquent factors. (Includes a pattern of running away from home, a history of criminal activities, and/or associating with gang members).

Assessing MAYCIT: Youth may be referred through :

- Schools
- Police
- Probation
- District Attorney

2. **JOLT: Juvenile Offender Law Enforcement Team**

100% Youth Court: 2-6 month diversion program

Life plan essay

Apology letter

Community service hours (up to 75 hours)

Jury duty (max 4)

Counseling (mandatory)

Approximately 30 minors per month

The Juvenile Offender Law Enforcement Team (JOLT) is based in the Temecula Valley Unified School District. The team is a multi-agency task force. The agencies that participate are as follows: Riverside Sheriff's Department; Riverside Probation Department; Riverside Youth Services Center; Temecula Valley Unified School District; and, the Riverside District Attorney's Office. The program focuses on minors who are first time offenders for low level offenses such as: petty theft, possession of alcohol, tobacco, or marijuana, and truancy. Those minors who are selected for diversion through the JOLT program are required to participate in a Youth Court. The youth court is run almost exclusively by Temecula Valley students. There are student prosecutors, student defense attorneys, student bailiffs, and student jurors. The judge for the youth court is a deputy district attorney. Once the jury finds a minor guilty, they then impose the consequences. The range of punishments include any combination of the following: writing a life plan essay; writing an apology letter; up to 75 hours of community service; jury duty (for future youth courts); and counseling. The youth court prosecutes approximately 30 minors per month. The JOLT team performs several functions which augment the youth court. The team screens cases for the youth court, provides counseling services for minors sentenced through the youth court, monitors the progress of minors sentenced by the youth court, and, in appropriate cases will send non-compliant minors through the mainstream juvenile justice system.

3. SCORE: School and Community Out REach

Formal probation
Informal probation
School referrals
Family referrals
Stop Program: Truancy Program

Approximately 50+ minors in the program

Mission Statement

The mission of the School and Community OutREach Program (S.C.ORE) is to combat the growing juvenile delinquency problem in the Jurupa Community through a partnership between the Probation Department, Sheriff's Department, District Attorney's Office, Jurupa Unified School District, and Youth Service Center of Riverside.

Through referrals from the school district, Sheriff's Department and the Juvenile Court, the S.C.ORE Team will attempt early intervention with juveniles who are starting to demonstrate early delinquent behavior, such as school behavior and attendance problems as well as incorrigible behavior at home.

The team will also target first time criminal offenders, including Formal and Informal Probation Cases, in hopes of preventing further escalation through the juvenile justice system. Furthermore, the team will also seek to enhance public safety and create a safe learning environment throughout the school district by conducting follow up investigations, monitoring habitual offenders, and when appropriate, prosecuting juveniles to the fullest extent of the law.

A further objective of the S.C.ORE Team is to encourage parents and community to actively participate in positive educational, family and social experiences.

4. SARB: School Attendance Review Board

Dedicated deputy district attorney
Individual mediations
Group mediations
Prosecutions

Program Summary

The primary focus of the SARB process is the parent. The current SARB procedures and statutes assume the parent has control over the child's behavior. Therefore, the penalty scheme is directed towards parents, as opposed to students.

It is the current policy of the Riverside County District Attorney to assign one deputy district attorney (the SARB deputy) from the juvenile division to perform duties with respect to the enforcement of the compulsory education law and participation in the SARB process. Due to limited resources, the district attorney's office has directed its attention to early intervention. Thus, our SARB program focuses exclusively on parents whose children are both age 13 or below and grade 8 or below.

The SARB deputy has the following responsibilities which are to be performed under the immediate direction of the supervising deputy district attorney of the juvenile division:

- **Group Mediation**

Group Mediations are presentations to large groups of students and their parents. Organized by local SARBs, Group Mediation usually combines presentations by the local school SARB representative and the SARB deputy. The school representative will typically explain why the parents have been asked to attend the mediation and how the school representatives can help them address the issue of their children's attendance. The SARB deputy's focus is the explanation of compulsory education law and the district attorney's commitment to vigorously enforcing it.

- **Individual (DA) Mediations**

The SARB deputy conducts Individual or DA Mediations pursuant to Education Code section 48263.5 and Welfare and Institutions Code section 601.3. The focus of DA Mediation is to get the parent's attention, and the child's when appropriate, in a BIG WAY. In very blunt terms. Parents are told about the seriousness of poor attendance, that there are no acceptable excuses for such attendance, and that they are one very short step from criminal prosecution.

- **Prosecution of Parents**

The SARB deputy makes filing decisions and prosecutes parents for violations of the compulsory education law pursuant to Education Code section 48293. When appropriate, extreme case may be prosecuted pursuant to Penal Code section 272 (contributing to the delinquency of a minor).

- **County SARB**

The SARB deputy usually serves as the representative of the district attorney's office at the regular meetings of the Riverside County School Attendance Review Board. Although the supervising deputy district attorney (SDDA) for the juvenile division officially sits on the county SARB Board, the SDDA for practical reasons

often delegates this function to the SARB deputy. Currently, SARB Administrative Associate, Lloyd Nixon, represents our office at these monthly meetings. The county SARB provides a forum to coordinate efforts with those of the school districts and the local SARBs through the dissemination of new procedures, legal options, and feedback.

- **State SARB**

The California legislature enacted Education Code section 48325 in 1987 to establish a state-level School Attendance Review Board (State SARB), with the intent of bringing together interested participants to work collaboratively with the California Department of Education (CDE) to improve pupil attendance, reduce dropout rates, and improve student behavior in California public schools. This is an advisory body to the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

- **Program Management**

The SARB deputy manages the day-to-day programmatic aspects of SARB and is responsible for initiating changes and refinements to policies or procedures that make the district attorney's role in the process more efficient, effective, and responsive to those it serves.

D. Funding

1. BJA Federal Block Grant FY 2000 total \$545,000 (Funds all YAT components)
2. Summary - DA Share (Approximately 17-20% per year)

	Allocation*	Positions**
FY 96	\$ 90,000.00	DDA IV .5 FTE (full time equivalent)
FY 97	\$126,386.00	DDA IV .5 FTE
FY 98	\$119,993.67	DDA IV .5 FTE
FY 99	\$117,423.00	DDA IV .5 FTE
FY 2000	to be determined	
Total	\$453,802.67	

Assumptions

*Allocation: Federal portion only. 10% local cash match, plus interest on trust account

**Positions support Youth Accountability teams in Temecula, Jurupa, Indio, and Perris

3. SARB

	Allocation	Source	Position
FY 96	\$50,000.00	RCOE*	.5 DDA
FY 97	\$50,000.00	RCOE	.5 DDA
FY 98	\$50,000.00	RCOE	.5 DDA
FY 99	\$50,000.00	RCOE	.5 DDA
FY 2000	\$50,000.00	RCOE	.5 DDA

Note: Each block grant runs for two Federal Fiscal Years (e.g., 96 ran October 1, 1996 until September 30, 1998). The federal funding is actually .5 of two DDA positions. DA allocates 1.5 DDAs. County funding for the YAT program \$150,000. Total DA yearly resources 2.5 DDAs and support staff \$320,000. Currently no state funded grants available.

* Riverside County Office of Education

E. Riverside County Kids With Guns Protocol

Statement

In the past months the nation has been rocked by reports of shootings on school campuses. These incidents, together with the increase in violence involving youths with weapons has prompted the district attorney, law enforcement agencies, probation, consolidated courts, county superintendent of schools as well as local school districts, Mental Health, and the Department of Public Social Services to form a multi-disciplinary task force to explore prevention and intervention strategies in order to prevent future tragedies from occurring in Riverside County. The following is a summary of the agreement between the various members of the multi-disciplinary task force to address youths in possession on and off school campuses.

The members of the Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) have agreed in principle that:

1. Law enforcement will investigate and report the circumstances of the offense and will expand the investigation by contacting the parents and/or legal guardians and by making a home visit to conduct an evaluation.
2. Probation will detain the minor and coordinate the efforts of the MDT by making the appropriate referrals to the various agencies. Information and assessment from the combined members of the team will be employed in determining future intervention strategies where appropriate.

3. County Office of Education will make available information concerning the minor to the appropriate agencies, and serve as a liaison between MDT and local school districts.
4. Mental Health will provide a profile, which will be used by the various members of the team and will administer a mental assessment to determine the danger of the suspect to himself/herself and others. The results together with the information from other cooperating agencies will be used in making a final assessment, which will be shared with other members of the team where appropriate.
5. Child Protective Services (CPS) will research its database to determine whether they have an open file on the youth or his/her family. Should the agency have a file, information will then be shared with the appropriate agency.
6. Riverside County Office of Education, in conjunction with local school districts and social services agencies will develop an adjunct protocol to deal with threats or acts of violence, excluding acts where firearms are involved. The primary assessment tool will be the personality assessment profile developed by the Mental Health Department.
7. This protocol will be reviewed and assessed three months from the date of implementation by agencies involved.

See Appendix D for complete protocol.

IV. The Effectiveness of Local Crime Prevention Funding

The most significant and ongoing criticism about prevention programs is the lack of accountability for the money spent, the lack of performance standards, the lack of a science-based practical approach to determine what works. Does the program reduce or prevent crime? Universally, those administering probation and other prevention oriented programs complain that there is no funding allocated to their operational efforts to allow for the necessary follow-up on the long-term effectiveness of their programs.

It is interesting to note that in 1996, Congress mandated that the U.S. Attorney General provide a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of over \$3 billion in annual grants given to states and local law enforcement and communities in preventing crime? It also called for the evaluation to give special emphasis to factors that relate to juvenile crime and the effect of these programs on youth violence.¹

It would be beneficial for the Little Hoover Commission to review Chapter 10 of the final report commissioned by the NIJ which reviewed over 500 program impact evaluations. The bottom line: the effectiveness of most crime prevention strategies are unknown for lack of adequate evaluations. (See Appendix E Chapter 10 - Funding Effectiveness - A Report to the U.S. Congress).

A. The following recommendations were made to Congress and could easily apply to California's efforts in this area:

1. Set aside 10% of all DOJ funding of local assistance for crime prevention for operational program funds to be controlled by a central research office with OJP. This recommendation solves the inadequate evaluator control over program conditions for inferring cause and effect. A wide variety of strong scientific research designs become possible when program funding is available as an incentive for local agency evaluation partnerships. Police overtime, prison treatment programs, school-based prevention strategies could all be implemented in ways that may be less than optimally convenient for the local operational units, but which greatly increase the strength of the scientific evidence.
2. Authorize the research office to distribute the 10% evaluated program funds on the sole criteria of producing rigorous scientific impact evaluations, the results of which can be generalized to other locations nationwide. Allocating these funds

¹Note: In 1999, California spent \$474.4 million in 11 state departments operating 22 programs which were designed to prevent youth from engaging in gangs, crime or violence. An additional 35 programs which were indirectly involved in helping prevent such problems, e.g., after school programs, mentoring, teen pregnancy, spousal domestic violence, mental health counseling, therapy for victims of child abuse, etc.(Source: CDAA, 1999).

3. for research purposes simply adds to the total funding for which any local jurisdiction is eligible. Thus the Aevaluated program@funding becomes an additional incentive to cooperate with the research plan on a totally voluntary basis.
4. Set aside an additional 10% of all DOJ local assistance appropriations for crime prevention as defined in this report to fund the scientific evaluation costs. This recommendation makes clear the true expense of using rigorous scientific methods to evaluate program impact. The imperfections of most indicators of crime and justice require multiple measurement, already reflected in the statutory language authorizing COPS program evaluations. Victimization interviews, offender self-reported offending, systematic observation of high crime locations, observations of citizen-police interaction, and other methods can all cost as much or more than the program being evaluated. The costs can also be amortized over the many years of use to which strong scientific evidence can be put in guiding effective crime prevention. (See Appendix F - The Next Generation Multi-Problem Prevention: A Comprehensive Science-based Practical Approach).

Appendix Index

(**NOTE:** Appendices are available upon request from the office of the Little Hoover Commission, 925 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814, 916/445-2125, Fax: 916/322-7709, Little.hoover@lhc.ca.gov.)

- A. Prevention Program Models
- B. Risk Factors Chart
- C. How Prevention Systems Work Chart
- D. Kids With Guns Protocol
- E. Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising - Chapter 10 Effectiveness
- F. The Next Generation . . .